

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

BRYAN KANU,	:	Case No. 1:18-cv-38
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	District Judge Timothy S. Black
vs.	:	Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman
	:	
SIEMENS PLM, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This civil case is before the Court pursuant to the Order of General Reference to United States Magistrate Judge Stephanie K. Bowman. Pursuant to such reference, the Magistrate Judge reviewed the relevant pleading and, on March 8, 2019, submitted a Report and Recommendation (Doc. 19), recommending that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration and relief from judgment (Doc. 18) be denied. Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on March 18, 2019. (Doc. 20).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “The filing of objections provides the district court with the opportunity to consider the *specific* contentions of the parties and to correct any errors immediately.” *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 950 (6th Cir. 1981) (emphasis added). “A party’s objections are not sufficiently specific if they merely restate the claims made in the initial petition, ‘disput[e] the correctness’ of a report and recommendation without specifying the findings purportedly in error, or simply ‘object[ ] to the report and recommendation and refer[ ] to several of the issues in the case.’” *Bradley v. United States*, No. 18-1444, 2018 WL 5084806, at \*3 (6th Cir. Sept. 17, 2018) (quoting *Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995)). In other words, “[t]he filing of vague, general, or conclusory objections does not meet the requirement of specific objections and is tantamount to a complete failure to object.” *Cole v. Yukins*, 7 F. App’x 354, 356 (6th Cir. 2001). Here, because Plaintiff’s general objections merely reassert the same arguments previously raised, Plaintiff fails to provide “specific written objections” to the Report and Recommendations. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2) (emphasis added). Moreover, upon *de novo* review, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations are thorough and accurate, and, accordingly, **Plaintiff’s objections are overruled**.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered *de novo* all of the filings in this matter. Upon consideration of the foregoing, the Court determines that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 19) should be, and is hereby, adopted in its entirety. Accordingly:

1. Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendations (Doc. 20) are **OVERRULED**;
2. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. 19) is **ADOPTED**;
3. Plaintiff's motions to for reconsideration and relief from judgment (Doc. 18) is **DENIED**;
4. Any future motions in which Plaintiff attempts to relitigate issues previously decided may be summarily denied; and
5. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), the Court certifies that an appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith and, therefore, this Court **DENIES** Petitioner leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: 8/29/2019

s/ Timothy S. Black  
Timothy S. Black  
United States District Judge